

features of the invention. The claim defines a system which displays a real-time image of a user comprised of an image projection device fixed in a position relative to the user's eyes. This system further comprises a video control system coupled to the projection device and causing the image projection device to display instructional information and a real-time representation of the user, wherein instructional information is transmitted from one of a local or remote location, and is overlayed on the real-time representation of the user. A video analysis section is used to transform at least one measurement extracted from the real-time representation of the user into an audio signal.

In contrast Brostedt, fails to disclose a video analysis section for transforming at least one measurement extracted from the real-time representation of the user into an audio signal. Brostedt teaches (col. 5, lines 1-3; col. 6, lines 27-29; col. 7, lines 35-38) that the system allows a student to observe or view a taped or live swing of an instructor. In each instance of cited text the student mimics the swing of the instructor to learn the proper technique. On the other hand, the claimed invention allows the student to view the instructional information and also listen to measurements extracted from the data of the swing. There is no suggestion or teaching in Brostedt of any swing measurements being taken to aid in improving the students' swing. Since no measurements are recorded or extracted by Brostedt, it can not reasonably follow that Brostedt can transform measurements into an audio signal. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1, is allowable over the prior art.

Dependent claim 2 has been amended to more appropriately clarify the characteristic features of the invention and adds no new matter. Claim 2 more clearly

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202-408-4000

defines the instructional information of claim 1 as being any one of graphical video signal, an audio signal, and textual data. Since, claim 2 is dependent from claim 1, it is allowable for at least the same reasons previously discussed. However, claim 2 is further allowable on the grounds that Brostedt neither teaches nor suggests the instructional signal being in the form of an audio signal or textual data. In contrast, Brostedt defines the instructional information as being only in the form of an image. Therefore, Applicant's submit that claim 2, is allowable over the prior art.

Newly added dependent claim 19 more clearly define the instructional information of claim 1 as being at least one of an audio signal and textual data. Since this claim contains subject matter previously discussed with respect to claim 2, the Applicant submits that it is allowable for at least the same reasons.

Since claims 3-18 depend from independent claim 1, they are allowable for at least the same reasons given above.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 21, 2000

By: Walter J. Santcliff Reg. No. 24,914
for E. Robert Yoches
Reg. No. 30,120

LAW OFFICES

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
FARABOW, GARRETT,
& DUNNER, L.L.P.
1300 I STREET, N. W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005
202-408-4000